

Due May 1, 2008

**Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

***Request for Iowa Four-Year College/University
Performance Assessment System Funds***

College/University name: _William Penn University

Program Contact Person:

Name Kathryn A. Roe

Title Assistant Professor of Education

Address William Penn University

201 Trueblood

Oskaloosa, Iowa 52577

Telephone: 641-673-1193_____Fax: 641-673-1041_____

E-Mail roek@wmpenn.edu

Business Office Contact Person:

Name: Bonnie Johnson_____

Title: CFO_____

Address: William Penn University, 201 Trueblood, Oskaloosa, IA 52577____

Telephone: 641-673-1036____Fax:____641-673-1396_____

E-mail: johnsonb@wmpenn.edu_____

Statement of Assurances

Should a Performance Assessment System Award be made to the applicant in support of the activities proposed in this application, the authorized signature on the cover page of this application certifies to the Iowa Department of Education that the authorized official will:

1. Upon request, provide the Iowa Department of Education with access to records and other sources of information that may be necessary to determine compliance with appropriate federal and state laws and regulations;
2. Use grant funds to supplement and not supplant funds from nonfederal sources.

Certification by Authorized or Institutional Official:

The applicant certifies that to the best of his/her knowledge the information in this application is correct, that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution, and that the applicant will comply with the attached statement of assurances.

Typed or Printed Name of Authorized Official

Title

Signature of Authorized Official

Date

Please submit both electronically and hard copy to Barry Wilson, TOE Assessment Team Leader, Dept. of Ed. Psych. & Foundations, UNI, Cedar Falls, IA by May 1, 2008.

Process for Procuring Grant Funds:

1. Submit Grant Request Package; Postmarked by May 1, 2008

Grant Request Package Contents:

- Request for Performance Assessment System Funds Cover Page
- Action Plan
- Budget

2. Grant requests will be reviewed by the Assessment Committee, the Leadership Team, and the Iowa Department of Education.

3. Institution will be notified of a grant award by May 21, 2008

4. Contracts for awardees will be developed by the Iowa Department of Education upon notification to the IHE of the award.

5. It will take 30 days after the award notification for a contract to be executed and fully approved. This would be as per a June 1 notification.

6. Payments cannot be released until a contract is fully approved with all signatures.

7. Institutions should not incur costs before a contract is approved and plan accordingly.

8. To acquire each payment, an IHE must submit an invoice or letter with an original signature requesting funds. This is necessary for the release of each payment – fifty percent, forty percent, and final ten percent.

9. An Interim report must be submitted with an invoice by January 15, 2009. NOTE: an awardee will not receive the forty percent payment unless the Interim Report budget indicates that the first fifty percent has been spent.

10. A Final report must be submitted with an invoice by December 15, 2009

11. A report form or template is attached with this RFP. Please use it for the Interim and Final Reports. The form includes a narrative and budget.

The grant application and interim and final reports must be submitted electronically in addition to hard copy.

Criteria for Performance Assessment System Awards:

Grant funds are available for use by recipients for purposes including but not limited to faculty development and training, design or modification of performance tasks, procedures for assuring reliability and validity of assessments, database software or hardware to facilitate data management and reporting, and technical services including programming support.

Funds may be used for expenses such as: faculty release time, personnel for clerical work, travel, lodging and meals, consultants, hardware, and materials including software. Four year colleges or universities that receive significant numbers of transfer students from community colleges are encouraged to include funding for providing feedback to two-year institutions on the performance of their graduates.

I. Context

Describe current program including number of teaching candidates graduated per year and number of full-time and part-time faculty teaching education courses. Indicate any unique features of the program that will help reviewers better understand your assessment needs. If you received a previous assessment system award, attach a copy of your final report or summarize results of your first year of work.

William Penn University is a very small, private institution whose principal mission has been to provide educational opportunities to those who may not have such opportunities otherwise. This means that many of the WPU students are first time college students or are students who have not been successful elsewhere and have come to Penn in an effort to turn around their lives. Penn attracts students from the nearby area, from all over the US and from abroad.

There are between 30 and 50 graduates in education each year. The *Annual Summary Report on Practitioner Preparation* reports there were 38 graduates in the 2007-2008 school year. The Education Division has 7 full time faculty and 4 part time faculty. The Education Division is the largest division or department at WPU.

Limited funds dictate that college personnel and the education faculty wear many hats. Most of the education faculty teach overloads every semester. Penn does not have a full time career services center. In the past year, a person was hired part time to provide some career services to Penn graduates. Penn does not have a regular faculty or staff position to collect, interpret, and maintain data. A limited database is maintained by the Education Division's Administrative Assistant tracks final portfolio scores and current addresses of graduates, if known. The same person maintains teacher candidate credential files.

Despite these limitations, Penn is gaining an area reputation for excellence in teacher preparation as shown from surveys collected through the auspices of the past two TEQ grants.

Candidate Assessment

Class sizes at Penn are relatively small. Education classes are generally 12 to 25 students. All Penn faculty are assigned a certain number of students in their teaching area for whom they act as advisors. Advisors are the only ones who can register students for classes. They check in with students regularly to see how each student is doing. If the student is having difficulties, the advisor helps him/her devise a plan to overcome the problem. Some advisors have acted as tutors for advisees. Others have offered a sympathetic ear and advice when the student has personal difficulties. The small classes and active advisor-advisee program allows faculty to get to know teacher candidates relatively well. The advisor-advisee system is a strength at Penn and provides a personal touch to what could be an impersonal candidate assessment system.

All education majors are formally assessed using a portfolio based upon the Iowa Teaching Standards plus the University's dispositions. Student portfolios are regularly assessed with students contributing at least three artifacts in each area including student teaching artifacts. Elementary teaching candidates take the PRAXIS II as an additional assessment.

Student teacher supervisors collect field experience teacher-supervisor and/or cooperating teachers' evaluations of the student teachers, using both the state-created assessment and another, faculty-created survey.

The faculty and members of the Teacher Education Advisory Committee have annually discussed the possibility of moving to an electronic portfolio system. Upon the recommendations of these two groups, such a system is not, at this time, a priority.

Previous Teacher Education Quality Grants

The first TEQ grant was used to quantify the data collected from cooperating teachers, to solicit data from graduates and employers. These data were collected via paper and pencil surveys. While the data gathered was put to use, several flaws were identified. The second TEQ grant was used to correct these flaws. First, surveys were created and put on Survey Monkey to allow data collection to be more anonymous, and therefore more accurate. Data taken from the cooperating teachers' evaluations of student teachers have tended to be generous, even when conversations with the cooperating teachers have revealed problems.

During the May 2008 Education Division retreat, the data collected from student teachers and cooperating teachers during the latest round of surveys were examined. These data were also compared to data collected during the previous year. This information is being used to examine course content, especially in the area of assessment.

Using the Grant Data to Determine Needs

The previous TEQ grant allowed the Education Division to collect data which was used to decide on changes to courses, to further the discussion on how best to meet the needs of both the secondary and elementary majors, and how best to collect data for this kind of program review.

Part of the past year's TEQ grant was used to fund, in part, a retreat for the Education Division. During the retreat, the data were examined and discussed.

Respondents to the on-line surveys were asked whether or not the on-line system was preferable to paper and pencil surveys, and whether or not the "right" questions were being asked. Further, the number of completed surveys compared to the return of paper and pencil surveys has led to the conclusion that the on-line system is preferable to paper and pencil.

The Education Faculty has thoroughly discussed the advantages and disadvantages of collecting information from field experience teachers and we have determined that a different set of data would be most appropriate.

During Teacher Education Committee meetings, and the retreat, we discussed the use of Survey Monkey for administrator feedback. Administrators attending the TEC meetings said they would find doing a survey on-line easier and faster than setting aside time for a paper and pencil survey.

II. Project Narrative

We propose to further refine our system of collecting data for program assessment.

Collecting Data from Field experience teacher-supervisors

Field experience teacher-supervisors are a potentially rich source of data that can be used for program assessment, especially in the area of teacher dispositions. While these teachers are, usually, only working with two to four Penn students per year, they are able to see these teacher candidates “up close and personal.” Field experience teacher-supervisors complete an evaluation of the teacher candidate after the field experience, however, these evaluations are shared with the individual students. Our experience has been that the teacher-supervisors have been more generous on paper than they have been in conversations with Penn faculty. Data from individual field experience teacher-supervisors would reflect only a few candidates per year, however, the data from all of these teachers in a year may help us point out more specific needs, and may be more useful for its being relatively anonymous.

Collecting Data from Current Employers of Penn Graduates

The state requires that we collect feedback from employers of our graduates, and we see this as the true litmus test of the quality of our teacher preparation program. This is, therefore, an area to which we would like to devote the time to create a feedback instrument that yields much useful data, plus one that school administrators will not feel as burdened by the request for this information.

Electronic Data Collection

We propose to continue to make use of electronic data collection for the above.

Proposal

We propose to use the grant to

- ☐ Purchase a membership from SurveyMonkey
- ☐ Develop a survey for field experience teacher-supervisors
- ☐ Refine or re-develop a survey used for school administrators/employers.
- ☐ Put all of these surveys on SurveyMonkey.
- ☐ Continue to share data collected at data workshops and a retreats with the Education Division, Dean, and TEAC,
- ☐ Share data with community colleges and institutions that tend to serve as feeder institutions to Penn.
- ☐ Determine program needs using the above.

III. Action Plan –

Goal	Objectives	Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget Request
Program Assessment: <input type="checkbox"/> Develop on-going system for receiving feedback from field experience teacher-supervisors. <input type="checkbox"/> Develop an on-going system of receiving feedback from recent WPU teacher education graduates and school administrators/ employers of recent Penn graduates. <input type="checkbox"/> Sustain current program feedback system for student teachers and cooperative teachers. <input type="checkbox"/> Sustain proposed system.	Refine survey questions for graduates, student teachers, employers.	Meet or conference via email with Education faculty, members of the Teacher Education Committee and area administrators; collect suggestions; rewrite surveys; get further feedback from above.	Assessment Manager, Office Manager	October 2008	\$285
	Use on-line program to collect data.	Purchase membership in Survey Monkey	Office Manager	September 2008	\$200
		Re-create surveys in Survey Monkey.	Assessment Manager	October - November 2008	\$500
		Notify prospective respondents (graduates, employers, field experience supervising teachers, student teachers, cooperating teachers) of on line survey.	Assessment Manager, Office Manager, college student worker	November 2008; March 2009	\$144.50
		Compile data.	Assessment Manager, college student worker	December 2008 and April 2009	\$545

		Hold mini-data retreat with Teacher Education Committee	Assessment Manager, Office Manager; Teacher Education Committee Members; student worker	April 2009	\$580
		Hold data retreat with Education Division	Education Division faculty, Office Manager, student worker (for preparation)	May 2009	\$1329.50
		Prepare report and summary for WPU faculty, admissions counselors, and administration.	Assessment Manager	June-August 2009	\$286.25
		Prepare report and summary for "feeder" institutions.	Assessment Manager	June-August 2009	\$286.25
		Present information to faculty in other divisions who work with teacher candidates.	Assessment Manager	August 2009	\$0
		Print, copy, mail, and distribute report.	Office Manager, college student worker	August-September 2009	\$557.50
	Refine on-line surveys	Review all on-line surveys for content.	Education Division faculty	August-September 2009	\$175
		Revise all on-line surveys as needed.	Assessment Manager; college student worker	September-November 2009	\$472.50
		Renew SurveyMonkey membership		September 2009	\$200
		Budget planning for program assessment	Division Chair	December 2009	\$0
				Total	\$5561.50

IV. Sustainability Plan.

The program evaluation plan set in place through the TEQ grant would be sustainable after this grant cycle. The main financial and time burden of setting up such a system is at the front end. Maintenance requires less money and time. The planning work and survey creation would already be done through the auspices of the TEQ grants.

Training on how to use the program, and templates for presenting the data will already be established. Points contributing to sustainability include:

- The on-line data collection saves many, many hours of time and energy over previous paper and pencil systems. These latter were launched somewhat sporadically due to the cost in man-hours and tedium.
- Renewing membership with SurveyMonkey; data already collected can be “stored” with SurveyMonkey as well as downloaded to the university network.
- Showing data to faculty and TEAC meetings is relatively easy using the on-line system compared to using Excel or other data management systems, so that it is now far easier to share and review this data at TEAC meetings or at retreats.
- Faculty or assessment manager support of the system would decrease by approximately $\frac{3}{4}$. This remaining time could be paid for through summer “release” time, or one or two “overload” credits during the regular school year.
- Because the system is already in place and template exist (or will exist) for notification emails or letter, a student worker could be hired to take on these duties for far less cost.
- While the Education Division retreat time away from campus would be ideal, this could be done on-campus during the summer; in current budget projections, faculty development monies could be used, in part, to fund a data retreat.
- The Education Division has become used to having this data available and to using it in decision-making. This decreases the likelihood of abandoning it.

V. Budget Requests

Personnel		
Wages		\$4156.50
Expenses (Travel, Meals, Lodging)		\$575
Professional Services/Professional Development		
Fees		
Expenses (Mileage, Meals, Lodging, Room Rental)		
Software		\$400
Hardware		
Supplies and Materials		\$260
Phone/Mail		\$170
Other – specify:		
Other – specify:		
Total		\$5561.50

VI. Budget Narrative:

Personnel

Assessment Manager

Personnel expenses will cover the equivalent of release time for the assessment manager, the equivalent of release time for 4.15 credit hours of summer school teaching.

Total = \$2075

Faculty Stipends

- \$25 for each of seven faculty members to review and refine previous survey instruments during a meeting outside of school time. (\$175)
- Paying stipends for one of the TEAC meetings so that the meeting can go longer, and to encourage greater participation from area professionals: \$25 for each of seven WPU education faculty (\$175), and \$25 per professional attendee up to 7 (\$175)
- \$100 per faculty for a two day faculty retreat (\$700)
- \$25 for each of seven faculty members to review and refine all surveys at end of grant period. (\$175)

Total = \$1400

College Student Worker

College student worker to be paid \$7.25 per hour for a total of 57 hours.

Total \$406.50

Administrative Assistant:

The Education Division's Administrative Assistant to be paid at a per diem rate of \$110 for work after normal working hours to a total of 4 days, including attendance at retreat.

Total \$275

Total Personnel Costs = \$4156.50

Expenses

- Cabins and food for 2 day, 2 night Education Division retreat (\$500)
- Food and beverages for Teacher Education Advisory Committee mini data retreat. (\$75)

Total = \$575

Software

Purchase two years unlimited membership in SurveyMonkey, an on line survey manager and data collection software/service.

Total = \$400

Supplies and Materials

Cost of printing, paper, envelopes for meetings, retreat, and distribution of reports.

Total = \$260

Postage

Cost of postage to mail reports and send follow up post cards to potential respondents.

Total = \$170